DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 365 HE 033 130

AUTHOR	Russell, Alene Bycer
TITLE	Issue Priorities and Trends in State Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
PUB DATE	2000-01-00
NOTE	17p.
AVAILABLE FROM	State Higher Education Executive Officers Association, 707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202-3427 ($12); Tel: 303-299-3686; Fax: 303-296-8332; e- mail: sheeo@sheeo.org; Web site: http://www.sheeo.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Articulation (Education); *College School Cooperation; Computer Uses in Education; *Distance Education; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Governing Boards; Higher Education; *Labor Force Development; Marketing; Policy Formation; *Professional Development; State Departments of Education; Student Financial Aid; Teacher Evaluation; Technology Transfer; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	State Higher Education Executive Officers Assn

ABSTRACT

This report presents findings of a survey in October 1999 of State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO) members asking them to rate the importance of 27 issues and to respond to questions about change over the past five years. The first section of the report discusses the quantitative ratings of the issues and how these ratings have changed over the past decade. Respondents rated the following five issues as the most important to states: teacher preparation and professional development, workforce preparation, effectiveness and accountability, linkages between K-12 and postsecondary education, and instructional technology/distance learning. Other issues that remain high in importance include: access and diversity, financial support for higher education, and student financial aid. The report also addresses SHEEOs' changing roles and relationships, noting their increasingly important policy leadership role in the states and the greater focus on marketing and external relations. The survey instrument is appended. (CH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 365

Issue Priorities and Trends in State Higher Education

January 2000

Alene Bycer Russell

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2A

SHEEO State Higher Education Executive Officers
707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2700, Denver, Colorado 80202-3427 ~ (303) 299-3686

© Copyright 2000 by the State Higher Education Executive Officers. All rights reserved.

Alene Bycer Russell is Senior Research Associate at SHEEO.

Copies of this report are available for $12, prepaid, from SHEEO, 707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2700, Denver, Colorado 80202-3427; telephone 303-299-3686; fax 303-296-8332; e-mail sheeo@sheeo.org; web site www.sheeo.org

The State Higher Education Executive Officers is a nonprofit, nationwide association of the chief executive officers serving statewide coordinating boards and governing boards of postsecondary education. Its objectives include developing the interest of the states in supporting quality higher education; promoting the importance of state planning and coordination as the most effective means of gaining public confidence in higher education; and encouraging cooperative relationships with the federal government, colleges and universities and other institutional state-based associations. Forty-nine states and Puerto Rico are members.

Issue Priorities and Trends in State Higher Education

Since the late 1980s, the State Higher Education Executive Officers association (SHEEO) has periodically surveyed its members about the most important higher education issues of the day. Most recently, in October 1999, surveys were sent to the chief executive officers (SHEEOs) of statewide coordinating and governing boards in the 50 states. SHEEOs were given the opportunity to rate the importance of 27 specific issues and to respond in their own words to a series of questions about change over the past five years. Responses were obtained from 49 states.

This report presents the findings of that survey. The first section discusses the quantitative ratings of the issue priorities and how these ratings have changed over the past decade. Information from the open-ended questions is presented in the remainder of the report: the second section describes in more detail how SHEEO priorities are changing and the factors that give rise to some of these developments; the final section addresses the changing roles and relationships of SHEEO agencies and highlights some common themes. A copy of the survey instrument is provided in the appendix.

SHEEOs Rate the Issue Priorities

Survey respondents were asked to rate the importance of 27 higher education issues, using a five-point scale of '1' equaling "not important" to '5' equaling "very important." Respondents were directed to consider the importance of these issues *for the state overall*, not simply to reflect their own viewpoints or their agencies' agendas. In most cases the SHEEOs themselves provided this information, but in a few cases other high-level staff members completed the survey. Readers should keep in mind that the ratings presented here reflect the judgment of SHEEO agency leaders only. Readers are also reminded that our sample size is small, even though it represents nearly the entire universe of state higher education agencies. Mean scores should be treated as approximate, and small differences between items should not be over-interpreted as representing meaningful differences or trends.

Table 1 lists SHEEO issue priorities in order of importance in 1999. The top issues in the states are:

- Teacher preparation and professional development
- Workforce preparation
- Effectiveness and accountability
- K-16 systems/linkages between K-12 and postsecondary
- Instructional technology/distance learning.

Many other issues are rated high as well, revealing the large number of "front burner" issues facing higher education today.

Perhaps most interesting, however, is how issues are shifting in importance over time. When SHEEO last collected this information in 1996, the dominant issue was adequacy of overall state financial support, reflecting lean years in state appropriations. While this issue is still an important one, it ranks relatively lower than several other issues.

Table 1

1999 SHEEO Issue Priorities, In Order of Importance, Compared to Earlier Years

Mean Value, Based on Responses from 49 States
Using a Scale of 1="Not Important" to 5="Very Important"

	1999	1996	1992	1989
teacher preparation and professional development[1]	4.40	3.78	3.87	4.10
workforce preparation	4.35	4.00	3.73	3.82
effectiveness and accountability	4.24	4.40	4.38	4.08
K-16 systems/linkages between K-12 and postsecondary[2]	4.12	3.86	3.72	3.96
instructional technology/distance learning	4.11	4.24	n/a	n/a
access and diversity[3]	4.09	3.57	4.28	4.38
adequacy of overall state financial support	4.07	4.53	4.54	n/a
tuition rates and overall student costs	4.02	4.20	4.04	3.90
economic development/research initiatives[4]	3.93	2.94	3.14	4.04
transfer and articulation	3.92	n/a	n/a	n/a
amount and types of student financial aid	3.91	3.80	3.72	3.71
quality of undergraduate education	3.91	4.02	4.35	4.47
adequacy and maintenance of facilities	3.61	3.35	3.49	3.96
library and data networks	3.58	3.41	n/a	n/a
faculty salaries	3.48	3.16	n/a	n/a
state funding models	3.41	n/a	n/a	n/a
student learning productivity	3.40	3.81	n/a	n/a
student progress/degree completion/time to degree	3.32	n/a	n/a	n/a
institutional roles and missions	3.28	3.61	3.46	3.94
faculty workload and productivity	3.22	3.88	3.77	n/a
academic quality assurance/program review and approval	3.20	n/a	n/a	n/a
admission standards	3.16	3.22	n/a	n/a
administrative productivity[5]	3.16	3.43	n/a	n/a
tuition prepayment/college savings plans	3.08	n/a	n/a	n/a
enrollment management	2.89	3.06	n/a	n/a
faculty supply	2.71	n/a	n/a	n/a
state-level governance changes	2.52	2.98	n/a	n/a

Note: The top five issues in each year are shaded.

Sources: Survey of 1999-2000 Higher Education Issue Priorities and Trends (1999), SHEEO Survey on State Coordination and Governance (1996), SHEEO Survey on Faculty Workload Issues and Other State Concerns (1992), and SHEEO/ECS State Issues Survey (1989). The wording of some items has varied over time, but the basic meaning is largely consistent. For example, 1996 items that are worded differently from 1999 items above are provided here:

[1] In 1996, worded "teacher education and preparation."

[2] In 1996, worded "linkages between K-12 and postsecondary."

[3] In 1996, worded "minority student access and achievement."

[4] In 1996, worded "adequacy of support for university research, specialized graduate education, and other economic development initiatives."

[5] In 1996, worded "productivity of institutional administrative processes."

This shift reflects, no doubt, the fact that state appropriations to higher education reached an all time high in FY99, with states benefiting from a strong national economy and higher education having a growing share of state general fund budgets. (For more information, see *Financing Higher Education: An Annual Report from the States* by Mary McKeown-Moak, SHEEO, February 1999.)

Several substantive issues have grown in importance over the years. Teacher preparation has made a dramatic comeback after declining in importance since 1989; ranked 11th in importance in 1996, it moved to the top of the list in 1999. Interest in workforce development and K-16 systems have both shown gradual increases over the past decade. Effectiveness and accountability, while a more important issue area than ten years ago, ranks relatively lower today than it did in 1996. Instructional technology/distance learning, a relatively new and quite important issue in 1996, still ranks very high but is no longer as singularly dominant on the policy agenda of states. Access and diversity, rated quite high in the early part of the decade had dropped significantly the last time we surveyed SHEEOs. Now this issue area is rising again in importance, most likely a result of challenges to affirmative action being made around the country and consequent concerns. Finally, it is noteworthy that in 1999, concern about faculty salaries is slightly more important than concern about faculty workload and productivity, though neither issue is currently in the top half of the list. This contrasts with the policy environment in 1996 when concern about faculty workload and productivity was significantly higher than concern about faculty salaries. (SHEEO is currently engaged in a survey of faculty issues and policies and will issue a report in the spring.)

We briefly explored differences between coordinating board states and governing board states, and found that by and large, as Table 2 indicates, the overall patterns are similar. Teacher preparation, workforce preparation, and effectiveness and accountability are rated among the top five important issues on both lists, and many issues are rated similarly by both groups. However, some small differences do show up in the data that might reflect real differences in the authority and concerns of coordinating boards and governing boards. On the governing board list, financial issues are generally rated somewhat higher, with tuition rates/overall student costs and adequacy of overall state financial support among their top five issues. On the coordinating board list, K-16 systems, instructional technology, and access and diversity round out their top five issues. We present these findings to stimulate thinking about these issues, cautioning readers not to over-interpret some rather slight differences in means.

In sum, SHEEOs identified a large number of issues as very important to their states in 1999, and they are not singularly focused on any one area, such as financial concerns. When we explore their own sense of how things are changing, some connections among these issues and some common themes begin to emerge.

SHEEOs Discuss Changing Priorities

Let us take a closer look at the most important higher education issues of the day, based on the comments of the SHEEOs themselves.

Table 2
1999 SHEEO Issue Priorities, In Order of Importance:
Coordinating Boards Compared to Governing Boards

Mean Value, Based on Responses from 49 States
Using a Scale of 1="Not Important" to 5="Very Important"

	All (N=49)	Coord Boards (N=29)	Gov Boards (N=21)
teacher preparation and professional development	4.40	4.41	4.38
workforce preparation	4.35	4.34	4.33
effectiveness and accountability	4.24	4.31	4.19
K-16 systems/linkages between K-12 and postsecondary	4.12	4.21	4.00
instructional technology/distance learning	4.11	4.14	4.10
access and diversity	4.09	4.14	4.05
adequacy of overall state financial support	4.07	3.93	4.19
tuition rates and overall student costs	4.02	3.79	4.29
economic development/research initiatives	3.93	3.93	3.90
transfer and articulation	3.92	3.86	4.00
amount and types of student financial aid	3.91	4.03	3.71
quality of undergraduate education	3.91	3.86	3.95
adequacy and maintenance of facilities	3.61	3.59	3.62
library and data networks	3.58	3.66	3.48
faculty salaries	3.48	3.34	3.67
state funding models	3.41	3.28	3.60
student learning productivity	3.40	3.38	3.40
student progress/degree completion/time to degree	3.32	3.41	3.19
institutional roles and missions	3.28	3.24	3.33
faculty workload and productivity	3.22	3.07	3.48
academic quality assurance/program review and approval	3.20	3.14	3.33
admission standards	3.16	2.93	3.45
administrative productivity	3.16	3.10	3.29
tuition prepayment/college savings plans	3.08	3.34	2.71
enrollment management	2.89	2.59	3.29
faculty supply	2.71	2.69	2.76
state-level governance changes	2.52	2.45	2.67

Note: The top five issues for each group are shaded.

Note: Survey responses were received from 50 agencies representing 49 unique states. For one state only, both "joint members" of the SHEEO organization responded. These responses were averaged in the first column so the state was counted only once; they were counted individually in the second and third columns.

Improving teacher education programs is on everyone's 'must do' list.

Teacher preparation and professional development. Many SHEEOs noted that strengthening the preparation of teachers has become a much higher priority today than in the past. As one SHEEO succinctly put it:

- *"Improving teacher education programs is on everyone's 'must do' list."*

Part of the interest stems from teacher shortages; California, for example, needs to hire 250,000 to 300,000 teachers over the next ten years. But much of the interest also comes from a growing K-16 focus and concerns about strengthening student achievement and the preparation of high school students for college and the workforce. Teacher quality is at the center of new statewide K-16 programs in which collaboration across sectors is essential. For example, Louisiana's Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning is working closely with the State Department of Education in developing innovative pre-service programs for teachers, programs to upgrade teaching skills, and an alternative certification system.

Federal programs have had some positive impact in this area. Every state has benefited to some extent from the Eisenhower Professional Development Program that provides resources to strengthen the skills of veteran teachers, and new federal legislation such as the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants, aimed at improving pre-service programs, is generating interest in some states. As one SHEEO indicated:

- *"Federal dollars have reinforced and shaped our efforts to improve educator preparation and quality of current teachers."*

At the same time, however, there are concerns about the potential loss of federal funds for teacher professional development as well as uncertainty about the implementation of new State Teacher Education Report Cards. Nevertheless, teacher preparation is increas-ingly being defined as a "front burner" issue for postsecondary education, a result of many and varying pressures coming into play.

We are facing increased expectations from the state for the university system to assume responsibility for economic development.

Economic development and workforce issues. Many SHEEOs emphasized the overriding importance of economic development issues in their states and the growing role of higher education in meeting workforce demands. Increasing external demands are clearly affecting the priorities of SHEEO agencies:

- *"Adult population requirements and new workforce demands have made us more conscious of higher education's role in workforce development and the economic success of the state."*

- *"We are facing increased expectations from the state for the university system to assume responsibility for economic development."*

And states are actively responding. In Oklahoma, for example:

> *"Our improved infrastructure has made possible significant advances in economic and workforce development and improved partnerships with the corporate community. Our proactive and more visible positioning is timely in that increased demand on state revenue has required improved marketing both for state and external funding resources. The creation of the agency's new Office of System Advancement and Economic Development is indicative of the new focus."*

The federal Workforce Investment Act of 1998 was cited as providing the opportunity for new and innovative approaches to workforce development. One respondent enthusiastically described her state's participation in several workgroups convened by the state Workforce Commission; its involvement with Local Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs), Regional Planning, One-Stop Service Delivery, and Youth Councils; and its central role as coordinator of postsecondary representation. However, another SHEEO noted that while this Act calls for a unity of state players, *"counterpart federal programs are regulated by different acts and departments of the federal government that defy state coordination."* Perhaps the observation of a third respondent is indisputable: *"The impact of the Workforce Investment Act remains to be determined."*

Many states are involved in strategic planning for economic development and in collaborations and partnerships with other state agencies and business for workforce development. Common attributes of their activities include:

- more support for faculty research efforts and initiatives that support state economic growth
- greater attention to technology transfer, global interconnectedness, and competition
- more focus on the role of community colleges and on their need to respond quickly and effectively to state job needs
- more interest in seeking support from the private sector
- more interest in career-linked liberal arts and on meeting vocational demands
- more attention being paid to the needs of non-traditional working adults.

Clearly, growing demands in the areas of economic and workforce development are having a profound impact on many SHEEO agencies.

Effectiveness and accountability. These have been top priority issues throughout the decade and continue to play an important role in the activities of SHEEO agencies. Whether a result of accountability bills passed by the state legislature or proactive moves taken by SHEEO agencies, there is a high level of interest in both the academic and financial performance of institutions. Agencies are continuing to improve their database capabilities, develop new performance measures, produce annual report cards, conduct new research studies, and adopt performance-based funding strategies. Concerns about efficiency, administrative savings and cost reduction, and institutional effectiveness abound.

In response to accountability concerns, SHEEO agencies are playing a larger role as information agents for higher education, responding to many more information and data inquiries. These requests

come from legislators, governors, institutions, and the public. Federal legislation, as well, imposes additional reporting demands on agencies, including State Teacher Preparation Report Cards and the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, as well as changes to IPEDS reporting and new definitions for race/ethnicity reporting.

Some states are clearly feeling the burden, having difficulty keeping up with the demand for accountability reporting and policy studies. One state, California, has reorganized the agency to improve its ability to provide timely and high quality information:

Because of proactive initiatives to make our system more competitive and accountable, the agency has gained significant credibility with state leaders.

- *"We have made internal structural changes to increase the capabilities of our agency and of the staff and to make our data more readily available to policymakers, the higher education systems, and the general public. Our greatest demand is to respond to changes in technology, to improve our web page, and to improve our ability to make our information more user-friendly and available to decision-makers and the public."*

In some states, efforts to be more accountable are paying off:

- *"We have worked closely with the governor's office, legislature, and the entire postsecondary community. By creating a system of accountability that sets higher expectation standards that reward innovation and creativity, we have re-established public trust and confidence in higher education."*

- *"Because of proactive initiatives to make our system more competitive and accountable, the agency has gained significant credibility with state leaders."*

Based on more than a decade of evidence, we may conclude that effectiveness and accountability will not go away as important priorities. How SHEEO agencies respond may, however, make a considerable difference in their roles in the state, and ultimately, in the quality of their educational institutions.

K-16 systems/linkages with K-12. Many SHEEOs commented on the growing importance of linkages between K-12 education and postsecondary education. In some cases, members are involved in new partnerships and collaborations with the K-12 sector; in other cases, they speak of K-16, P-16, or even K-20 systems:

- In Ohio, for example, *"the biggest change has been the new focus on K-16 education as a single system. We have become much more involved in efforts to define expectations for high school graduates, to seek new solutions to remediation problems, and to improve the preparation of teachers."*

- In Massachusetts, *"another significant change has resulted from the statutory requirement that the Chancellor of the Board of Higher Education serve as a voting member of the Board of Education and the Commissioner of Education serve as a voting member of the Board of Higher Education."*

The biggest change has been the new focus on K-16 education as a single system. We have become much more involved in efforts to define expectations for high school graduates, to seek new solutions to remediation problems, and to improve the preparation of teachers.

➢ In Idaho, *"there is greater emphasis and clarification as constitutional authority over all education and educational training in a K-20 seamless system...."*

State legislation has provided the impetus to many, but not all, of these efforts. Federal legislation has also played a role. For example, several SHEEOs spoke positively of the new federal GEAR UP program. By providing resources to states to enhance access and outreach activities, this legislation will support postsecondary education's effort to develop greater linkages with the K-12 system.

Instructional technology/distance learning. Offering a whole new approach to teaching and learning, technology issues emerged in the 1990s with a strength and constancy that is not likely to diminish. Many SHEEOs described their growing roles related to:

- use of technology in the teaching/learning process
- strengthening the technology infrastructure
- growth in electronic courses and programs
- technology planning
- developing partners and collaborative efforts.

In Connecticut, for example:

➢ *"We are focusing more on technology infrastructure, usage, and potential to stimulate innovation in education. The subject of distance learning has brought new parties of interest to the table--including business technology councils interested in employment training programs and public interest groups concerned about 'digital divides.'"*

Several members mentioned that the increased interest in technology has resulted from changing demands on higher education: demands imposed by growing enrollments, demands for new courses and programs, and demands from new constituents (K-12 students and adult workers). However, it may be too much to expect that technology can solve all of higher education's challenges:

➢ *"Demands for new programs and courses/ programs in new locations have created opportunities, but also tensions and pressures. Technology has substantially increased pressures on resources and student/faculty expectations."*

Access and diversity. Interest in access and diversity may have waned somewhat in recent years, but our 1999 survey indicates that this issue area is again rated high by SHEEOs. When asked about changing priorities over the past five years, one SHEEO simply commented:

➢ *"Access, access, access."*

To some degree, challenges to affirmative action--by voter referenda and court rulings--that

have occurred over the past decade have raised this issue to a new level of importance. For example:

- *"Our priorities have changed because of the changing statewide context in which we work. Proposition 209 was passed in California, and an ever-present priority for us - providing access to an increasing number of students of increasing diversity - is more important than ever."*

Yet, in this context, responses may have to be more complex and creative. Rather than employing race-based policies, states are acting on this priority through growing interest in the preparation of high school students, early outreach activities, and generally *"preparing for a more ethnically diverse student population in our colleges and universities."*

Generating financial support for higher education. In terms of issue priorities, SHEEOs rated "adequacy of overall state financial support" as a relatively lower priority in 1999 than they did just three years before. Thanks to a strong national economy and higher state appropriations for higher education for FY99, this reflects, no doubt, a less financially stressful time for higher education leaders. However, a few SHEEOs noted that concerns about resources and funding are increasingly important topics in their states. They noted the following developments:

- greater reliance on tuition revenues
- greater emphasis on private fundraising and the generation of alternative funding sources
- creation of revised funding plans
- renewed interest in facilities maintenance and capital construction funding.

Student financial aid. Though not at the top of the list, student financial aid policies have remained an area of importance for many state agencies over the past decade. In particular, SHEEOs follow changes in federal student aid policy with great interest, and several respondents commented on the impacts of both new federal tax credit policies as well as changes in traditional programs. Their assessments vary, however, and some respondents are more optimistic than others. For example, one SHEEO commented:

- *"The HOPE program has been an invaluable tool in the Board's effort to provide greater access to public higher education. It served as a forceful lobbying tool for working with the legislature to increase further state financial aid programs."*

A few states indicated that there has been substantial increased state appropriation support for student financial aid in recent years, and a few have been given new responsibilities for financial aid administration. South Carolina, for example, noted the dramatic expansion of both state merit-based and need-based scholarship programs in the past five years as one of the agency's major priority shifts. Other states, however, were less optimistic, and a small number noted that their state programs are not adequately funded.

States are struggling to develop new policies and programs and to address demands from constituents in a more flexible way. For example, they are being challenged to pay more attention to funding continuing education/ professional development programs to support lifelong learning and for scholarship/waiver eligibility for high school

students taking college courses, including charter school and home schooled students.

SHEEOs Discuss Changing Roles and Relationships

State higher education agencies and boards are playing an increasingly important policy leadership role in their states. Though not a new observation, this theme emerging from the current study further confirms what others have described as the movement of coordinating and governing boards away from regulatory roles toward larger state policy roles, particularly occurring since the mid-1980s. (For example, see *Trends in State Coordination and Governance: Historical and Current Perspectives* by Rhonda Martin Epper and Alene Bycer Russell, SHEEO, October 1996, or *1997 State Postsecondary Education Structures Sourcebook*, the Education Commission of the States, December 1997.) The current study lends further support to this perspective and provides more recent documentation. In their own words, SHEEOs told us:

- *"We have evolved from a regulatory agency to the primary leadership entity for higher education in our state."*
- *"Our structure has not changed, but a new role of the Commission is to act as a 'change agent' in higher education."*
- *"We have become much more actively involved with state policy formulation, and more frequently asked to lead and participate in 'change.'"*

Agency operations. Along with these role changes, new board/staff relations are apparent, and several SHEEOs reported new ways of doing business in their states. These include:

- changes in the structure of board meetings with more focus on large policy issues and less on routine administrative matters
- reduction of the number of items on the board agenda to permit more discussion of policy issues
- shift from a strong subcommittee structure to a "committee of the whole"
- reorganization of staff to support new committees; greater effort by staff to provide information to regents.

We have evolved from a regulatory agency to the primary leadership entity for higher education in our state.

There is no single trend as to size of operations and staff support. For example, restructuring in Louisiana, aided by additional state funding, *"has enabled the Board of Regents to expand its administrative structure and staff to have the necessary support to fulfill its leadership advocacy and regulatory responsibilities."* In other cases, we heard just the opposite--cases of downsized administrations and no increases in funding to match new statutory responsibilities.

- *"We're swamped! We'll need more staff to continue to respond to the variety and volume of added responsibilities."*

In terms of institutional relations, the survey also revealed a mixed picture. A few respondents described a tendency toward greater decentralization of decisions and a shift of responsibility to the campuses, for example, in the area of program review and approval. Others talked about a greater "system" perspective than ever before, with more emphasis on inter-institutional planning and service delivery.

Collaboration and external relations. In earlier sections of this report, we described how specific policy areas are increasingly addressed through collaborative work:

- working with the K-12 sector on teacher preparation and professional development, student academic achievement and remediation, student outreach, and other issues
- working with businesses and other state agencies on workforce and economic development
- using technology tools and developing partnerships, including private sector partnerships, for new kinds of program delivery
- developing more collaborations in connection with federal grant opportunities and projects.

One strong theme to emerge from this study is the growing importance of external relations on the whole, marked by this increased collaboration with external entities as well as:

- more responsiveness to state needs overall
- viewing the governor and legislature as primary customers (with a greater need to inform and to continually reeducate legislators and their staffs about higher education issues due to legislative term limits)
- more emphasis on improving public awareness and perceptions of higher education and on encouraging universities to send out more positive messages
- a greater market research orientation.

➢ Along these lines, many SHEEOs commented on new roles and relationship:

➢ In Minnesota, *"our agency is used increasingly as the entity that facilitates interaction among and collaboration with organizations that share responsibility for education in our state."*

...we play a greater role as broker and facilitator.

➢ In North Carolina, *"we play a greater role as broker and facilitator. We pay greater attention to public/private partnerships."*

➢ In California, *"an External Affairs unit has been established that combines governmental relations, publication, and institutional relations to better deliver the message and make better use of our data in the policy arena."*

Conclusion

Based on the responses of the chief executive officers of statewide higher education coordinating and governing boards in 49 states, this study described some of the ways in which the priority issues, roles, and relationships of state higher education agencies and boards have shifted in recent

years. In particular, we noted that state higher education agencies and boards are playing an increasingly important policy leadership role in their states. They are working simultaneously on many issues, and those of top importance as they face the new millennium are: (1) teacher preparation and professional development, (2) workforce preparation, (3) effectiveness and accountability, (4) system linkages between K-12 and postsecondary education, and (5) instructional technology/distance learning. To address the priority issues and other cross-cutting policy areas, SHEEOs tell us they increasingly collaborate with K-12 education, other state government agencies, institutions, and the private sector. They are more market-focused than ever before and more responsive to the needs of their states. They spend more time and energy on external relations, in particular, in responding to state legislature and governor needs for information and answers. The federal government is seen both as a source of funding and catalyst for change in some areas, as well as a drain on resources with ever-growing accountability reporting requirements. As higher education is called upon to meet changing demands and to fulfill expanding purposes, state agencies and boards, while facing new challenges, have new opportunities to make a difference.

Appendix – Survey Instrument
Survey of 1999-2000 Higher Education Issue Priorities and Trends
October 1999

Section I - Issue Priorities

1. From the perspective of an "expert witness" on higher education, please rate the importance of each issue **in your state overall.** Your response should reflect the perspectives of diverse constituencies in your state (e.g., legislature, state and system-level agencies, institutions, and the general public), not just your own viewpoint or your agency's agenda.

	Not Important				Very Important
(a) quality of undergraduate education	1	2	3	4	5
(b) access and diversity	1	2	3	4	5
(c) teacher preparation and professional development	1	2	3	4	5
(d) institutional roles and missions	1	2	3	4	5
(e) effectiveness and accountability	1	2	3	4	5
(f) academic quality assurance/program review and approval	1	2	3	4	5
(g) administrative productivity	1	2	3	4	5
(h) student learning productivity	1	2	3	4	5
(i) instructional technology/distance learning	1	2	3	4	5
(j) library and data networks	1	2	3	4	5
(k) adequacy of overall state financial support	1	2	3	4	5
(l) state funding models (e.g., use of formulas, performance-based funding)	1	2	3	4	5
(m) tuition rates and overall student costs	1	2	3	4	5
(n) amount and types of student financial aid	1	2	3	4	5
(o) tuition prepayment/college savings plans	1	2	3	4	5
(p) enrollment management	1	2	3	4	5
(q) admission standards	1	2	3	4	5
(r) student progress/degree completion/time to degree	1	2	3	4	5
(s) transfer and articulation	1	2	3	4	5
(t) K-16 systems/linkages between K-12 and postsecondary	1	2	3	4	5
(u) workforce preparation	1	2	3	4	5
(v) economic development/research initiatives	1	2	3	4	5
(w) adequacy and maintenance of facilities	1	2	3	4	5
(x) faculty salaries	1	2	3	4	5
(y) faculty workload and productivity	1	2	3	4	5
(z) faculty supply	1	2	3	4	5
(aa) state-level governance changes	1	2	3	4	5
(bb) other *(describe)*					

Section II - Trends

2. How have the priorities of your agency changed over the past five years? *Please describe.*

3. How have your agency's roles and structures changed over the past five years? *Please describe.*

4. How has recent federal legislation affected your agency? *Please describe.*

5. How have changing demands affected your agency, such as demands from new constituencies or demands for new products? *Please describe.*

Respondent Information
State/Agency:
Respondent:

Thank you for your assistance in completing this survey. Please fax your reply by November 5, 1999 to Alene Russell at 303-296-8332.